

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1–13 and 28–34. Claims 1, 8, and 28 are being amended to further recite the features of the invention. Claim 45 was previously canceled. Claims 14–27, 35–44, and 46–50 have been withdrawn as the result of an earlier restriction requirement. As a result, claims 1–13 and 28–34 are pending for examination with claims 1, 8, and 28 being independent claims. The amendments made find support in the specification and do not constitute new matter.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1–13 and 28–34 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Richter et al (US 6,725,279) (“Richter”). Applicants traverse the Examiner’s rejection and points out that Richter does not teach, disclose, or suggest a, “topology describing a set of input multimedia streams, one or more sources for the input multimedia streams, a sequence of operations to perform on the multimedia data, and a set of output multimedia streams” as claimed by Applicants. None-the-less, Applicants have amended the claims to further recite the features of the invention.

Independent claims 1 and 28 have been amended to call for:

“...generating a topology of connections between one or more multimedia components in a topology generating element, the topology describing the one or more multimedia components, and the connections

Reply

Application Number: 10/603,328

Attorney Docket Number: 302124.01

between them, including a set of input multimedia streams, one or more sources for the input multimedia streams, a sequence of operations to perform on the multimedia data, and a set of output multimedia streams; transmitting the topology to a media processor; implementing the topology by instantiating and setting up the one or more multimedia components as described by the topology, the implemented topology of one or more multimedia components operable to process the multimedia data; and passing the multimedia data according to the implemented topology, the passing governed by the media processor.” (underlining added for emphasis)

Independent claim 8 has been amended to call for:

“...a topology generating element configured to generate a topology describing objects including a set of input multimedia streams, one or more sources for the input multimedia streams, a sequence of operations to perform on the multimedia data, and a set of output multimedia streams; a topology implementing element operable to instantiate and set up the objects as described by the topology, thus forming an implemented topology, the implemented topology comprised of instantiated objects and operable to process the multimedia data; and a media processor configured to govern the passing of the multimedia data to the implemented topology as described in the topology and govern the performance of the sequence of multimedia operations on the multimedia data to create the set of output multimedia streams;” (underlining added for emphasis)

Reply

Application Number: 10/603,328

Attorney Docket Number: 302124.01

As such, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 8, and 28 are not anticipated by Richter under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

In support of the noted claimed features, the original specification provides:

“...the topology **describing** a set of input multimedia streams, one or more sources for the input multimedia streams, a sequence of operations to perform on the multimedia data, and a set of output multimedia streams.” (portions para 6; underlining added for emphasis)

“...The topology provides a path that the data streams take through the media and stream sources, the transforms, and the media and stream sinks. In block 308, the topology loader will pass this topology on to the media processor. **The media processor sets up and implements the topology.** In block 310, the media processor will send messages to the core layer components to instantiate the objects called out by the topology loader.” (portions para 31; underlining and bolding added for emphasis)

Reply

Application Number: 10/603,328

Attorney Docket Number: 302124.01

Richter, on the other hand provides:

“...to create a subset of multimedia processing blocks, the application interface selects multimedia processing blocks to form said set, and then examines the input and output interfaces of said multimedia processing blocks selected in order to check whether all the multimedia data exchanges required to perform the task are possible within said subset and determine, for these exchanges, the encoding format of the multimedia data to be exchanged and the communication buses to be used to connect the different multimedia processing blocks of said subset in pairs according to the complementarity of the ports of their respective input and output interface.” (Richter, portions col. 2, lines 37–49; underlining and bolding added for emphasis)

“For each multimedia task, **application interface IA creates a subset of the multimedia processing blocks** required to run said task. In order to create these subsets, the application interface must know the capacity of each of the multimedia processing blocks to be connected in send mode or receive mode to the various communication buses in the system. It is for this reason that when the subset is created, application interface IA selects a first subset of blocks and then examines the input and output interfaces of the selected blocks to check whether all of the exchanges relative to the task to be run are possible.” (Richter, portions col. 3, lines 16–34; underlining and bolding added for emphasis)

Reply

Application Number: 10/603,328

Attorney Docket Number: 302124.01

As such, Richter seems to teach creating a subset of multimedia processing blocks and inspecting their interfaces to determine if they can interoperate within the subset. Alternatively, Applicants claim generating and implementing a topology wherein the topology describes objects and their connections and wherein the implemented topology has instantiated the described objects and their connections and is operable to process the multimedia data according to the topology description.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 8, and 28 are not anticipated by Richter under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Claims 2-7, 9-13, and 29-34 are each dependent on one of claims 1, 8, or 28. As such, claims 2-7, 9-13, and 29-34 are believed allowable at least in part based upon one of claims 1, 8, and 28.

Reply

Application Number: 10/603,328

Attorney Docket Number: 302124.01

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Reply

Application Number: 10/603,328

Attorney Docket Number: 302124.01

REPLY

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,
Microsoft Corporation

Date: November 6, 2007

By: /L. Alan Collins/

L. Alan Collins, Reg. No.: 57,646
Direct telephone (425) 703-8265
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

November 6, 2007

Date

/Kate Marochkina/

Signature

Kate Marochkina

Printed Name

Reply
Application Number: 10/603,328
Attorney Docket Number: 302124.01